Reply dated December 21, 2005 to Office Action of September 21, 2005

Page 9 of 15

## AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are six (6) Replacement Drawing Sheets that comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. The Replacement Drawing Sheets incorporate the following drawing changes:

In Figs. 1 and 6, figure numbers have been amended such that they are labeled consistent with the configuration of the drawings;

In Figs. 2(a), 3(a), 4(a), and 5(a), section lines have been provided as requested by the Examiner;

In Fig. 2, "(a)" and "(b)" have been amended to —Fig. 2(a)-- and —Fig. 2(b)--, respectively;

In Fig. 3, "(a)" and "(b)" have been amended to --Fig. 3(a)-- and --Fig. 3(b)--, respectively;

In Fig. 4, "(a)" and "(b)" have been amended to --Fig. 4(a)-- and --Fig. 4(b)--, respectively; and

In Fig. 5, "(a)" and "(b)" have been amended to —Fig. 5(a)-- and --Fig. 5(b)--, respectively;

In Fig. 5(a), reference numeral 16 has been added.

It is respectfully requested that the Replacement Drawing Sheets be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

Reply dated December 21, 2005

to Office Action of September 21, 2005

Page 10 of 15

**REMARKS** 

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. New claims 15-18 have been added.

**Drawings** 

The drawings have been objected to because the sections lines are not labeled properly.

Figs. 2(a), 3(a), 4(a), and 5(a) have been amended to provide a section line labeled II(b), III(b), IV(b), and V(b), respectively to overcome this objection.

Applicants respectfully submit that section lines in Figs. 2(b), 3(b), 4(b), and 5(b) need not be labeled because Figs. 2(a), 3(a), 4(a), and 5(a) do not correctly depict the cross section of Figs. 2(b), 3(b), 4(b), and 5(b), respectively.

For example, Fig. 2(b) is a cross section of Fig. 2(a) when viewed from the right with respect to the section line shown in Fig. 2(a). Therefore, the cross section of Fig. 2(b) would only show the left half of the inflator shown in Fig. 2(a).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

**Specification** 

The specification has been objected to because of some informalities.

The referenced prior art JP-A 2002-182995 and US Patent Application 2002/0093182 are correct publication numbers of JP and US patent publications.

An information disclosure statement citing these prior art documents have been submitted concurrently herewith as requested by the Examiner.

Reply dated December 21, 2005 to Office Action of September 21, 2005

Page 11 of 15

Claim numbers recited in page 4-12 of the specification have been deleted to overcome this objection.

With regard to other objections to the specification, the specification has been reviewed and amended to overcome this objection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

## Claim Objections

(a) Claims 1-10 have been objected to because of some informalities.

Claims have been amended to overcome this objection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

(b) Claims 11-14 have been objected to because a multiple dependent claim cannot be dependent on another multiple dependent claim.

Claims 11 and 13-14 have been amended to overcome this objection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

## Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

(a) Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because there is not support in the specification for the use of two igniters.

Claim 10 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because of some informalities.

Reply dated December 21, 2005

to Office Action of September 21, 2005

Page 12 of 15

Claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

(a) Claims 1-2, 5-6, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by Headley (USP 5,678,856). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Headley discloses, in Figs. 1-4, an inflator provided with a housing 22, a diffuser 24

attached to the housing 22, a closure 26 via barrel 108 that seals a chamber 40, and an initiator

28 provided inside the diffuser 24. As stated in col. 3, lines 22-24, the initiator 28 includes a foil

layer 102, and inner insulator 106 and a barrel 108.

As shown in Figs. 1-3, the initiator 28 (corresponds to the "igniter" of the claimed

invention of the present application) is in contact with the closure 26 via barrel 108 prior to an

activation of the initiator 28. In other words, the initiator 28 is not "spaced apart" from the

closure 26. Accordingly, Headley fails to disclose or suggest the "igniter" as recited in claim 1.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend only from claim 1.

Claims 2, 5-6, and 9, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Docket No.: 0425-1082P

Application No.: 10/678,088

Reply dated December 21, 2005

to Office Action of September 21, 2005

Page 13 of 15

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by (b)

Buchanan et al. (USP 5,582,428). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Buchanan discloses, in Fig. 3, an inflator 56 having an upper hemisphere 58, a lower

hemisphere 60 attached to the upper hemisphere 58, a burst disc 100 sealing an exit port 98

provided in the upper hemisphere 58, a peripheral wall 110, and a first heating device 72.

The first heating device 72 is for heating the gas inside a first chamber 68 such that the

burst disc 100 is ruptured by an increase in pressure inside the first chamber 68 due to the

increased temperature of the gas.

Therefore, in Buchanan, the first heating device 72 merely heats that gas and does not

generate "a rupturing energy generated by activation of the igniter to act in an oblique direction

directly to the rupturable plate to rupture the rupturable plate." Accordingly, Buchanan fails to

disclose or suggest the "means for causing a rupturing energy" as recited in claim 10.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 7-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (a)

over Headley in view of Swann et al. (USP 6,295,935). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend only from claim 1.

Claims 4, 7-9, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency

on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Reply dated December 21, 2005 to Office Action of September 21, 2005

Page 14 of 15

(b) Claims 3 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Headley in view of Frey et al. (USP 5,263,740). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend only from claim 1.

Claims 3 and 9, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

New Claim

Claim 15, indirectly dependent on claim 1 or 10, is allowable at least for its dependency

on claim 1 or 10.

Independent claim 16 is allowable at least because none of the prior art of record disclose

or suggest the "deforming member" as recited in claim 16.

Claims 17 and 18, variously dependent on claim 16, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 16.

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of these claims is earnestly

solicited.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the

rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the

Reply dated December 21, 2005

to Office Action of September 21, 2005

Page 15 of 15

telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Terrell C. Birch

Registration No.: 19,382

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Six (6) Replacement Drawing Sheets (Figs. 1-6)

Substitute Specification - 16 pages Comparison Specification - 17 pages